

AD-A085 288


CIVIL ENGINEERING LAB (NAVY) PORT HUENEME CA
TRAFFIC TESTING OF A FIBERGLASS-REINFORCED POLYESTER RESIN SURF--ETC(U)
FEB 80 P S SPRINGSTON
CEL-TN-1572

F/G 1/5

UNCLASSIFIED

NL

1 OF 1
21A
3000-00



END
DATE
FILMED
7-80
DTIC

ADA 085288

Technical



TN no. N-1572

Note

title: TRAFFIC TESTING OF A FIBERGLASS-REINFORCED POLYESTER
RESIN SURFACING FOR RAPID RUNWAY REPAIR

author: P. S. Springston

date: February 1980

sponsor: Naval Facilities Engineering Command

program nos: YF60.536.001.01.M33A



CIVIL ENGINEERING LABORATORY

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION BATTALION CENTER
Port Hueneme, California 93043

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

80 6 9 187

DDC FILE COPY

LEVEL II

12
B's

DTIC
ELECTE
JUN 10 1980

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER TN-1572 ✓	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. DN244122	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER AD-A085 288
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) TRAFFIC TESTING OF A FIBERGLASS- REINFORCED POLYESTER RESIN SURFACING FOR RAPID RUNWAY REPAIR		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final; Oct 1978 - Sep 1979
7. AUTHOR P. S. Springston		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS CIVIL ENGINEERING LABORATORY ✓ Naval Construction Battalion Center Port Hueneme, California 93043		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 62760N; ✓ YF60.536.001.01.M33A
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Facilities Engineering Command Alexandria, Virginia 22332		12. REPORT DATE Feb 1979
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) (13) 442		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 40
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) (1) Final Rept. Oct 78 - Sep 79		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (16) F60 536 (17) YF60 536 001		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) (14) CEL-TN-1572 Rapid runway repair, bomb damage repair, expedient surfacing, expedient pavements, reinforced plastics.		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This report documents traffic tests of a fiberglass-reinforced polyester resin (FRP) membrane, conducted at the Rapid Runway Repair Test Facility of the Air Force Engineering and Services Center at Tyndall Air Force Base, Fla. The membrane functions primarily as a trafficable cap, preventing foreign object damage to aircraft, over a backfilled bomb crater. The membrane also reduces rutting, from rolling aircraft wheels, in a 24-in.-thick crushed (continued)		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

391111

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

20. Continued

limestone base course overlaying backfilled debris. In the tests, applied traffic consisted of 150 and 20 coverages of load carts simulating F-4 and C-141 aircraft main gears, respectively. Experimentally recorded soil strain and surfacing deflection data are compared with predictions formulated previously, in which the finite element method of structural analysis was used. Recommendations are provided for further evaluation necessary for the certification of the concept for rapid runway repair.

Library Card

Civil Engineering Laboratory
TRAFFIC TESTING OF A FIBERGLASS-REINFORCED
POLYESTER RESIN SURFACING FOR RAPID RUNWAY
REPAIR (Final), by P. S. Springston
TN-1572 40 pp illus February 1980 Unclassified

1. Rapid runway repair 2. Bomb damage repair I. YF60.536.001.01.M33A

This report documents traffic tests of a fiberglass-reinforced polyester resin (FRP) membrane, conducted at the Rapid Runway Repair Test Facility of the Air Force Engineering and Services Center at Tyndall Air Force Base, Fla. The membrane functions primarily as a trafficable cap, preventing foreign object damage to aircraft, over a backfilled bomb crater. The membrane also reduces rutting, from rolling aircraft wheels, in a 24-in.-thick crushed limestone base course overlaying backfilled debris. In the tests, applied traffic consisted of 150 and 20 coverages of load carts simulating F-4 and C-141 aircraft main gears, respectively. Experimentally recorded soil strain and surfacing deflection data are compared with predictions formulated previously, in which the finite element method of structural analysis was used. Recommendations are provided for further evaluation necessary for the certification of the concept for rapid runway repair.

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
Air Force Experience	1
Alternative Concept	1
OBJECTIVE	2
DEFINITION OF TERMS	2
PRELIMINARY DESIGN	3
SUBGRADE PREPARATION, TESTING, AND INSTRUMENTATION	4
MEMBRANE CONSTRUCTION	4
TRAFFIC TESTING	5
TRAFFICABILITY	6
MEMBRANE COST	7
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	8
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	9
REFERENCES.	9

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Date _____	
Initial _____	
Signature _____	
A	

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Air Force Experience

The Air Force has been involved in research and development efforts to achieve a capability for rapidly repairing bomb-damaged runways. Currently, an established time constraint requires the identification and rehabilitation of a 50 by 5,000-foot runway to standards suitable for operation of aircraft within four hours after attack. For example, repair of three craters produced by 750-pound bombs should be completed within 4 hours.

With the present Air Force procedure (Ref 1), all broken pavement is removed, the crater is backfilled with broken pavement and crater ejecta to within 12 inches to 24 inches (NATO nations) of the original pavement surface, and this upper 12 to 24 inches is filled with compacted select base material (from previously stockpiled material). The compacted select base material is brought to the grade of the original pavement. AM-2 airfield landing mat is assembled on undamaged pavement near the crater and dragged over the filled crater after compaction has been completed.

The Air Force is presently studying effects upon aircraft of roughness induced by high-speed transitions from pavement to surface-mounted matting (1.5-inch bump height). There may be critical combinations of spacing and ground speed that would be hazardous to aircraft carrying external stores of munitions or wing-tip mounted fuel tanks.

Alternative Concept

This report documents the traffic testing of an alternative concept to AM-2 matting for a bomb crater cap - a fiberglass-reinforced polyester (FRP) membrane. Such a membrane is relatively thin and is, in effect, a flush-mounted cap. The Civil Engineering Laboratory (CEL) has conducted considerable research in the development of a system using fiberglass-reinforced polyester resin as an expedient beach and roadway surfacing material for vehicular traffic (Ref 2,3,4,5). The specialized chemicals and related equipment are known as the Advanced Multipurpose Surfacing System (AMSS).

A concept was developed during early FY79 which adapted AMSS technology to solve the problem of rapid runway repair (Ref 6). The concept consisted of a 1/2-inch-thick, prefabricated FRP membrane, which would be manufactured by military personnel during peacetime and would be shallow-buried adjacent to a runway. After an attack the membranes would be uncovered and towed over bomb craters backfilled with debris and crushed stone base course material. The membranes could be quickly cut to size to fit individual craters using carbide-tipped saw blades.

The FRP cap functions primarily as a cover to prevent the crushed stone from causing foreign object damage (F.O.D.) to aircraft although the cap serves to increase trafficability of the underlying base course through some distribution of wheel load.

One of the problems in the use of this cap was selection of the type of fastener needed to hold the cap and runway surface together. After consideration of several types of fasteners, a torque-set type of rock bolt was selected for fastening the FRP cap to undisturbed pavement around the crater perimeter. A test plan was written (Ref 7) and in late FY79 the FRP concept was traffic-tested under simulated F-4 and C-141 aircraft wheel loads at Tyndall AFB, Fla. with the assistance of the Research Division of the Air Force Engineering and Services Center.

OBJECTIVE

This report documents results of traffic testing of a 1/2-inch-thick FRP membrane. The membrane was trafficked by two load carts simulating the main gears of an F-4 aircraft (267-psi tire pressure and 27,000-pound single wheel load) and a C-141 aircraft (185-psi tire pressure and 141,000-pound twin-tandem wheel load). The trafficking was conducted with assistance from the Air Force Engineering and Services Center (AFESC) at Tyndall AFB, Fla. The test site consists of three 20 by 20-foot openings in a 12-inch-thick concrete pavement overlying a 6-ft-deep low-strength (CBR 4 to 6) clay subgrade (Ref 8). The trafficability of the FRP membrane concept for rapid runway repair (RRR) is evaluated herein, and recommendations are presented for further research.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For information and clarity, certain terms used in this report are defined as follows:

Test section: The prepared area, including the surfacing for test purposes.

Traffic lane: Area of the surfacing that is subjected to the rolling wheel load of the load cart.

Subgrade: Soil processed under controlled conditions to provide the desired bearing capacity. The base course was placed on this.

California Bearing Ratio (CBR) : A measure of the bearing capacity of the soil based upon its shearing resistance. CBR is calculated by (1) dividing the unit load required to force a standardized piston into the soil at a standardized rate by the unit load required to force the same piston at the same rate into a standard sample of crushed stone and (2) then multiplying by 100.

Deflection: Temporary bending of the surfacing under the static load from the test wheel of the load cart.

Transverse dishing: Permanent bending of the surfacing perpendicular to the direction of traffic.

Longitudinal dishing (with reference to panel): Permanent bending of the surfacing parallel to the direction of traffic.

Direction of traffic: The direction in which the load cart travels on the test section. The direction of traffic is representative of actual landing directions with respect to construction joints.

Coverage: One application of the test wheel of the load cart over every point within the traffic lane.

Load cart: A specially constructed cart used in AFESC engineering tests for simulating aircraft taxiing operations.

Test wheel: The wheel on the load cart that supports the test load.

PRELIMINARY DESIGN

Prior to traffic testing, an investigation was conducted to optimize the design of FRP membrane and crushed stone base course topping (Ref 6). A finite element computer code, SLIP (Ref 9), developed by E. L. Wilson of the University of California and later modified by CEL was used to evaluate the effects of membrane and base course thicknesses on system performance. Close estimates of Young's modulus for the crushed limestone base course and clay subgrade materials which would be used in the traffic testing were required for accurate computer prediction of soil-membrane response. Samples of these soils were obtained from the AFESC and triaxial tested to determine response characteristics and representative moduli.

An iterative procedure was followed whereby the computer-predicted soil stress state was located on the appropriate soil stress-strain curve plotted from experimental data, and the elastic modulus was then put into the computer program and the code re-run. The sequence was iterated until moduli and stress states from experimental (triaxial) data matched those for the representative elements of the SLIP crater model.

The actual traffic section profile is depicted in Figure 1, and the idealized traffic section profile for computer analysis is presented in Figures 2 and 3. The final design specified a membrane of 1/2 inch and a base course depth of 24 inches. Initial static deflection beneath the F-4 wheel load for this system was estimated to be 0.25 inch with a predicted deflection basin as shown in Figure 4. The predicted soil-strain distribution is plotted in Figure 5. More complete information concerning the soil testing, computer analysis, and preliminary design is presented in Reference 6.

SUBGRADE PREPARATION, TESTING, AND INSTRUMENTATION

For trafficability testing, a fat clay (CH*) subgrade simulated the debris of a backfilled bomb crater. Physical properties and mineralogical composition of the clay are given in Tables 1 and 2. The clay subgrade was excavated to a depth of 24 inches below the surface elevation of the adjacent concrete, and moisture/density tests as well as tests to determine the CBR of the clay were conducted by AFESC personnel (Table 3). The average subgrade CBR in six tests was found to be 4.8%.

A 24-inch-thick lift of crushed limestone base course material with gradation (Figure 6) conforming to ASTM Test Designation D-2940 (Ref 11) was spread on the clay surface and compacted at a moisture content of 3.8%** by dry weight with a RAYGO 400 vibratory roller for 32 coverages. After final grading, moisture/density tests were again conducted, and the base course was instrumented with three pairs of soil strain gages.

The strain gages (Bison soil strain sensors) were placed in a vertical stack with sensors in parallel and coaxial alignment and with individual gages located at 6-inch intervals to a depth of 18 inches below the upper surface of the base course. Sensor cables were buried within the subgrade.

The soil strain sensors are manufactured by Bison Instruments, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn. The sensors are individual disk-shaped coils which operate through electromagnetic mutual inductance coupling of any two sensors. The sensors are not connected and are "free floating" in the soil; thus, they contribute minimal interference with soil movement. The sensors were connected by coaxial cable to a Bison Instruments Model 4101A Soil Strain Instrument which contained the driving, amplification, balancing, calibration, and recording controls, and a self-contained power supply. Although spacing resolution with this system was 0.0001 inch, laboratory bench tests indicated that spacing measurement was repeatable to within +0.0032 or -0.0030 inch.

MEMBRANE CONSTRUCTION

A 22-ft sq FRP membrane was fabricated on concrete adjacent to the test pit. The membrane was constructed of four layers of 4020-weight (40-oz/sq yd woven roving and 2-oz/sq ft chopped strand) fiberglass mat for a total finished membrane thickness of approximately 1/2 inch. Alternate layers of polyethylene, 15-lb roofing felt, and mold release paper separated the fiberglass mat from the concrete to prevent adherence of polyester resin to the concrete. The fiberglass is packaged in rolls having a width of 6-1/2 feet. Therefore, it was necessary to lap strips of fiberglass mat to achieve the finished membrane width of 22 feet. Adjacent fiberglass strips were overlapped by 8 inches to produce the membrane.

*Classification by the Uniform Soil Classification System (Ref 10).

**Optimum was 6.0% by ASTM Test Designation D698-70, Method C, Ref 12.

Two layers of fiberglass were positioned and saturated with polyester resin (PPG Industries RS 50338) and immediately rolled with an aluminum roller to expel air trapped in the laminate. A third layer of fiberglass next was positioned, saturated with resin, and rolled. Repeat of the procedure for a fourth layer of fiberglass completed membrane construction (Figure 7).

During fabrication the volumes of catalyst and promoter which were mixed with the polyester resin were carefully controlled to provide a slow cure of the resin. Time to gelation was approximately 1 hour. The final layer of fiberglass was saturated with resin before resin curing had begun in the previous layers. A long gel time is critical since less shrinkage of the laminate is associated with a slow cure. Furthermore, gelation did not begin until all fiberglass had been positioned, thus providing the membrane with sufficient weight to prevent warping, which would have accompanied a fast cure and low laminate weight.

After fabrication, a towbar was bolted to one edge of the membrane and a 2-1/2-cu-yd capacity front-end loader towed the membrane across the test pit (Figure 8). The membrane was secured to the concrete pavement with 1/2 x 3-in. torque-set type rock bolts (Figure 9) manufactured by the Rawlplug Co. of New Rochelle, N.Y. The bolts were placed at 4 feet on-center along the membrane perimeter. Holes of 5/8-in.-diam were drilled in the concrete with a Rockwell rotary hammer to accommodate the bolts.* Two 4-in.-sq pieces of fiberglass mat were laminated to the membrane at each bolt location to locally strengthen the mat and to provide a flush surface at bolt heads.

TRAFFIC TESTING

A specially designed load cart (Figure 10) loaded to 27,000 pounds was used for simulation of a main gear of a fully loaded F-4 aircraft. The load cart is constructed with an outrigger wheel to prevent overturning and is powered by a front-wheel-drive truck. The load cart was equipped with a 30-7.7, 18-PR tire inflated to 265 psi. With the 27,000-lb wheel load, the tire has a contact area of about 102 sq in.

A traffic distribution pattern that would be encountered in actual runway operations was simulated. The pattern approaches a statistically normal distribution curve (Ref 13). Traffic started on one side of the test lane, and the load cart was driven forward and then backward in the same path for the length of the traffic lane. The path of the cart was shifted laterally 10 inches (the width of the tire print) on each successive forward trip. The interior 100 inches of the traffic lane was trafficked to six additional coverages. The center 60 inches of the traffic lane received two additional coverages for a total of ten coverages. The net result was that the center 60-in.-wide strip of the traffic lane

*The holes were inadvertently drilled to 5/8-in.-diam instead of the correct diameter of 1/2 inch. Several of these incorrectly installed bolts worked loose because of the moving wheel load. After the bolts were replaced in properly sized holes, they held properly, and no further problems were noted.

received 100% of the traffic, the 20-in. wide strips on either side of the center 60-in. strip received 80%, and the 10-in.-wide outside strips received only 20% of traffic (Figure 11).

At intervals of 0, 80, 100, and 150 coverages, the following data were recorded for the test section:

1. Static deflection beneath the test wheel
2. Soil strain beneath the test wheel
3. Permanent deformation, including longitudinal and cross section profiles

The locations for data recording are shown in Figure 12.

After application of 80 coverages of the F-4 load cart, the crushed stone of the test section had compacted uniformly, without rutting, by approximately 1 inch (Figure 13). To demonstrate relocatability of the FRP membrane, it was removed from the test section, and 1-1/2 cu yd of crushed limestone was added, compacted, and graded to return the crushed stone to the grade of the surrounding concrete pavement. The FRP membrane was removed by unfastening the nuts from the tie-down bolts, placing a 6-in. x 6-in. x 20-ft FRP angle section under each of the two sides for skids and dragging the membrane off the test section. After final grading of the crushed stone, the membrane was dragged back over the test section and re-bolted to the concrete. Traffic was then continued for a total of 150 coverages (maximum specified by the AFESC) of the F-4 load cart (Figure 14).

After completion of trafficking with the F-4 load cart, an additional 20 coverages (specified by the AFESC) of traffic were applied to the test section with a load cart simulating a main gear of a C-141 aircraft (Figure 15). The cart contains a twin-tandem type gear having 4 tires inflated to 185 psi with a total gear load of 141,000 pounds. C-141 load cart traffic was applied in a distributed pattern (Figure 16).

TRAFFICABILITY

In summary, the FRP membrane performed exceptionally well under both the F-4 and C-141 load cart traffic. After 150 coverages with the F-4 load cart and 20 coverages with the C-141 load cart, the membrane (including the transitions from concrete to the membrane) remained completely serviceable and without any indication of any failure or wear. By 80 coverages of the F-4 cart, the crushed stone base course had densified such that its surface was approximately 1 inch below that of surrounding pavement (Figures 17 and 18). The membrane, however, had prevented any rutting of the base course (Figure 13). Thus, the densification indicated an increase in base course strength. The test section was readily restored to the proper grade by removal of the membrane and by addition of 1-1/2 cu yd of crushed limestone.

Soil strain data were recorded for the initial static load of the F-4 tire. Prior to trafficking, the load cart tire was positioned directly over the soil strain gages, and data were recorded. The strain data from this initial static loading were the only data which could be

meaningfully compared with analytical predictions derived from using SLIP which solves only linear-elastic, static problems. Good correlation was noted between the experimental data and the SLIP-predicted soil strain (Ref 6) for the load centerline location. A maximum deflection of 1/8 inch was measured during the traffic test at 0 coverages and was recorded adjacent to the tire using a 4-foot straightedge. This measurement coincides very closely with the analytical prediction (Figure 4). The complete profile was not measurable, since deflections were of such a small order of magnitude. Similar deflection (1/8 inch) was measured at 50, 80, 100, and 150 coverages (Figure 19).

Elevations were recorded at intervals of 0, 50, 80, 100, and 150 F-4 traffic coverages for stations marked on the FRP membrane. Profiles of four lines along the FRP surface (Figure 12) were plotted from the elevation data and are presented in Figures 20 through 23. From these figures, it is evident that the base course densification occurred originally within the first 50 coverages. After reworking of the base course (after 80 coverages), the majority of additional densification under the load cart traffic occurred in the 20 coverages between the 80- and 100-coverage data recording intervals (Figures 22 and 23). The application of 20 coverages of the C-141 load cart produced only very slight additional compaction of the base course (Figures 24 and 25). It is noted that only the crushed limestone deformed (compacted) during trafficking by the load carts. Although the FRP membrane conformed to the base course surface, dishing (permanent deformation of the FRP) did not occur. The FRP membrane performed elastically throughout trafficking.

MEMBRANE COST

The FRP membrane would be employed in place of AM2 matting as a cover to prevent foreign object damage to aircraft. As an additional feasibility factor, the cost of these two alternative covers was compared. Both material and military labor costs were included in deriving the cost of an FRP membrane.

The labor cost for a military crew (Table 4) for membrane fabrication was established as \$85.80/hr (Table 5). Membrane production rate was estimated as 714 ft²/hr using the AMSS equipment and estimating equipment and crew efficiency at 50%. Thus, the 1980 labor cost for producing the membrane would be approximately \$0.11/ft². The 1980 material cost for the FRP membrane is estimated as \$4.24/ft².* The total (labor plus material) cost of a membrane would be on the order of \$4.35/ft². This represents a savings of 64% over AM2 matting, which has an estimated 1980 price of \$12.00/ft² for electron beam welded, MOD 4 AM2 matting.**

The fastening system cost for both covers would be similar and was not considered. Each system would require the same quantity of base course material (to meet NATO specifications for an AM2 surfaced crater

*The following manufacturers were contacted: PPG Industries, Coating and Resin Division, Springdale, Pa. and Fiberglass Industries, Hexcell-Traverne Division, Amsterdam, N.Y.

**Fonecon, Jan 1980 with Ms. D. Braun, AM2 Product Manager, Martin-Marietta Corp.

repair), and each would offer extremely long shelf life. The cost savings is attributed to the simpler fabrication procedure utilized for membrane construction and the high production rate of AMSS equipment. AM2 cost is elevated by energy intensive and expensive fabrication processes involving alloying and tempering of the aluminum, extrusion of planks in a 24-in.-width (few available manufacturers), and the welding of end connectors.

Additional, less quantifiable benefits which would be derived from adoption of the FRP membrane concept of RRR include:

- Cycling of stockpiled polyester resin (pre-positioned war reserve stocks for the AMSS) which has a predicted 5-year shelf life. Membrane production would be a valid and valuable product for the aging polyester resin, thereby increasing its salvage value.
- Field training of Marine Corps personnel during peacetime to provide a high state of readiness and mobility for the employment of the AMSS in an amphibious objective area during war. The value of this training might be considered as offsetting the military labor cost associated with membrane fabrication.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The traffic tests conducted at the Rapid Runway Repair Test Facility of the AFESC have demonstrated the endurance of an FRP membrane to repeated F-4 and C-141 traffic when placed over a 24-in.-thick, compacted, crushed limestone base course overlying a low-strength clay subgrade. The FRP membrane proved to be removable and gave excellent performance without experiencing any failure or noticeable wear from the applied traffic or handling. In summary, RRR using FRP membranes and crushed stone is feasible and offers savings in construction of the cap of 64% over similar repair concepts using AM2 matting.

The following recommendations are presented for further research which is required to complete development of the FRP membrane concept of RRR:

1. Conduct a field test with a C-141 load cart to determine the adequacy of the FRP membrane and tie-down bolts for resisting braking and deceleration forces which would be produced by a C-141.
2. Conduct further analytical study in conjunction with field load cart traffic testing to determine whether base course thickness can be decreased, possibly through the use of a filter fabric at the base course-debris interface.*
3. Undertake field fabrication of membranes using the AMSS equipment to determine the largest size of membrane that would be feasible for field fabrication and handling.

*Hauling and placement of the base course is on the critical path (thus determining completion time) for the repair of a crater. Reduction of base course thickness would shorten repair time or reduce equipment requirements.

4. Investigate bonding and joining methods for the production of large membranes from several smaller segments if single-piece membranes of sufficient size cannot be field-produced for the repair of a 750-lb bomb crater.

5. Traffic test the completed concept under actual F-4 and C-141 operations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The valuable assistance and dedication of Mr. Leonard Woloszynski and Mr. Larry Underbakke, civil engineering technicians at CEL, in the preparation of the FRP membrane and installation of instrumentation is gratefully acknowledged. Appreciation is also expressed to the Air Force Engineering and Services Center for the use of the Rapid Runway Repair Test Facility, preparation and testing of the clay subgrade and crushed stone base course, and surveying and trafficking of the FRP membrane.

REFERENCES

1. Department of the Air Force. AFR 93-2: Disaster preparedness and base recovery planning. Washington, D.C., Jul 1974.
2. Civil Engineering Laboratory. Technical Note N-1346: Evaluation of a synthetic surfacing system for the Marine Corps, by D. F. Griffin. Port Hueneme, Calif., Jul 1974.
3. _____. Technical Memorandum M-53-76-1: Fiberglass reinforced polyester performance under dual wheel traffic loadings, by M. C. Hironaka. Port Hueneme, Calif., Jan 1976.
4. Civil Engineering Laboratory. Contract Report CR 78.018: Fabrication of fiberglass reinforced plastic surfacing under wet conditions. Dow Chemical U.S.A., Sep 1978.
5. _____. Contract Report CR 77.017: Improved chemical components for formulating fiberglass-reinforced plastic soil surfacing. Dow Chemical Company, May 1977.
6. _____. Technical Note N-1563: Fiberglass reinforced plastic surfacing for rapid runway repair by Naval construction forces, by P. S. Springston. Port Hueneme, Calif., Oct 1979.
7. _____. Technical Memorandum TM 53-79-3: Test plan for traffic testing of an expedient airfield pavement and a rapid runway repair concept, by P. S. Springston and Capt. M. McNerney, USAF. Port Hueneme, Calif., Feb 1979.
8. Civil and Environmental Engineering Development Office. Technical Report TR 79-14: Field test of expedient pavement repair. Tyndall AFB, Fla. (in publication).

9. Civil Engineering Laboratory. Technical Report R-763: Layered pavement Systems - Part I. Layered system design, Part II. Fatigue of plain concrete, by J. B. Forrest, M. O. Katona, and D. F. Griffin. Port Hueneme, Calif., Apr 1972.
10. Department of Defense. Military Standard No. MIL-STD-619B: Unified soil classification system for roads, airfields, embankments, and foundations. Washington, D.C., Jun 1968.
11. American Society for Testing and Materials. Designation D2940-74: "Standard specification for graded aggregate material for bases or subbases for highways or airports," 1978 Annual Book of ASTM Standards, Part 14. Philadelphia, Pa., 1978.
12. _____. Designation D698-70: "Standard test methods for moisture-density relations of soils using 5.5-lb rammer and 12-in. drop," 1978 Annual Book of ASTM Standards, Part 19. Philadelphia, Pa., 1978.
13. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station. Miscellaneous Paper No. 5-73-56: Lateral distribution of aircraft traffic, by D. M. Brown and O. O. Thompson. Vicksburg, Miss., Jul 1973.
14. NAVCOMPTNOTE: 7041 of 30 Nov 1979 Subj: Composite standard military, permanent change of station, and basic allowance for quarters rates.

Table 1. Physical Properties of Wewahitchka Clay (Ref 8)

Properties	Range	Average
Liquid Limit	57 - 79	65
Plastic Limit	21 - 30	25
Plasticity Index	30 - 52	41
Specific Gravity	2.58 - 2.67	2.61
CE-55 Opt Dry Density, pcf	110 - 115	113
Opt Moisture, %	13 - 15	14.5
CE-26 Opt Dry Density, pcf	105 - 109	107
Opt Moisture, %	13 - 16.5	14.5
CE-12 Opt Dry Density, pcf	98 - 102.5	99.0
Opt Moisture, %	11.5 - 18	15.0

Table 2. Mineralogical Composition of Wewahitchka Clay

<u>Mineral Constituents</u>	<u>Relative Sample Contents</u>
<u>Clay</u>	
Kaolinite	Intermediate (25%-50%)
Smectite	Common (10%-25%)
Clay-mica	Common (10%-25%)
<u>Non-clays</u>	
Quartz	Intermediate (25%-50%)
Feldspars	Rare (>5%)

Table 3. Soil Data for Clay Subgrade and
Crushed Stone Base Course

Test No.	Depth ^a (in.)	Wet Density ^b (pcf)	Dry Density (pcf)	Moisture Content ^b (%)	CBR ^c (%)
Clay					
1	24	118.9	90.3	31.7	4.8
	28	122.8	93.8	30.9	
	32	123.4	94.5	30.6	
	36	124.2	95.5	30.0	
Crushed Stone					
2	4	148.8	144.5	3.0	d
	8	149.2	145.0	2.9	
	12	147.3	143.0	3.0	
Crushed Stone					
3	4	148.8	143.4	3.8	d
	8	148.5	143.2	3.7	
	12	147.5	142.1	3.8	

^aDepth measured from surface of adjacent concrete.

^bAverage of two readings.

^cAverage of six tests.

^dNot measured.

Table 4. Typical AMSS Crew for FRP Membrane Fabrication

Pay Grade	No. of Persons	Function
O1	1	OIC - overall project coordination
E6	1	Jobsite supervisor
E5	1	Low-rate unit operator
E4	1	Crew leader - material resupply
E4	1	Spray-gun operator
E4	1	RT forklift operator
E3	2	Fiberglass handlers
E3	2	Hose handlers
E3	4	Fiberglass rolling crew
E4	1	Expediter
Total	15	

Table 5. Breakdown of AMSS Crew Labor Cost^a

Pay Grade	1980 Basic Hourly Rate (\$)	1980 Acceleration Factor	Accelerated Hourly Rate (\$)
O1	6.96	1.545	10.75
E6	6.71	1.695	11.37
E5	5.60	1.695	9.49
E4	4.87	1.695	8.26
E3	4.16	1.695	7.05
Total Crew Labor Cost			85.80

^aBasic hourly rates and acceleration factors extracted from Reference 14 (NAVCOMPTNOTE 7041).




Figure 1. RRR test section profile.




Figure 2. Idealized RRR cross section with crushed stone base.




Figure 3. RRR idealization mesh.




Figure 4. Deflection profile for 1/2-in. FRP over 24-in. crushed stone base.





Figure 5. Centerline soil strain.

11ND-NEL-3360/4 (REV. 6-68)

MECHANICAL ANALYSIS

COBBLES		GRAVEL		SAND			FINES	
COARSE	FINE	COARSE	FINE	COARSE	MEDIUM	FINE		

GRAIN SIZE IN MILLIMETERS UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM



SIZE OF OPENING IN INCHES		U.S. STANDARD SIEVE SERIES		GRAIN SIZE IN MM.	
1 1/2	1	4	10	0.075	0.001

SIEVE ANALYSIS		HYDROMETER ANALYSIS	
JOB	LOCATION	PLOTTED BY	DATE
1-1/2 in. - crushed limestone base - Tyndall Air Force Base, Fla.		LJW	6 Feb 79

Figure 6. Grain size distribution of Tyndall crushed stone (Ref 6).

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FILED IN TO LDC




Figure 7. Completed FRP membrane.



Figure 8. Towing completed FRP membrane.




Figure 9. Torque-set fastener, 1/2-in. x 3-in.




Figure 10. F-4 load cart.




Figure 11. Traffic distribution pattern for the F-4 load cart.




Figure 13. Crushed limestone base course
after 80 F-4 coverages.




Figure 14. FRP test section after 150 F-4 coverages.




Figure 15. C-141 load cart.




Figure 16. Traffic distribution pattern for the C-141 load cart.




Figure 17. Profiles of base course surface at lines A and B for 0 and 80 F-4 coverages.




Figure 18. Profiles of base course surface at lines C and D for 0 and 80 F-4 coverages.




Figure 19. Deflection of FRP membrane for F-4 wheel load at 100 coverages.





Figure 20. Profiles of FRP surface at lines A and B for 0 to 80 F-4 coverages.




Figure 21. Profiles of FRP surface at lines C and D for 0 to 80 F-4 coverages.




Figure 22. Profiles of FRP surface at lines A and B for 80 to 150 F-4 coverages.




Figure 23. Profiles of FRP surface at lines C and D for 80 to 150 F-4 coverages.




Figure 24. Profiles of FRP surface at lines A and B after 150 F-4 coverages and 20 C-141 coverages.




Figure 25. Profiles of FRP surface at lines C and D after 150 F-4 coverages and 20 C-141 coverages.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

AF HQ PREES Washington DC (R P Reid)
 AFB (AFITLD), Wright-Patterson OH: AF Tech Office (Mgt & Ops), Tyndall, FL: AFCEC XR, Tyndall FL: CE SCH.
 Wright-Patterson: HQ Tactical Air Cmd (R. E. Fisher), Langley AFB VA: HQAFESC/DEMM, Tyndall AFB, FL:
 MAC/DET (Col. P. Thompson) Scott, IL: SAMSOMNND, Norton AFB CA: Stinto Library, Offutt NE
 ARMY ARADCOM, Dover, NJ: BMDSC-RE (H. McClellan) Huntsville AL: DAEN-MCE-D (R L. Wight) Washington
 DC: DAEN-MPE-D Washington DC: ERADCOM Tech Supp Dir, (DELS-D-L) Ft. Monmouth, NJ:
 HQ-DAEN-MPO-B (Mr. Price) Tech. Ref. Div., Fort Huachuca, AZ
 ARMY - CERL Library, Champaign IL
 ARMY COE Philadelphia Dist. (LIBRARY) Philadelphia, PA
 ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS MRD-Eng. Div., Omaha NE: Seattle Dist. Library, Seattle WA
 ARMY CRREL, R.A. Eaton
 ARMY DARCOM AMCPM-CS (J. Carr), Alexandria VA
 ARMY ENG DIV ED-CS (S. Bolin) Huntsville, AL: HNDED-CS, Huntsville AL: HNDED-SR, Huntsville, AL
 ARMY ENG WATERWAYS EXP STA Library, Vicksburg MS
 ARMY ENVIRON. HYGIENE AGCY B620, Edgewood Arsenal MD: Water Qual Div (Doner), Aberdeen Prov
 Ground, MD
 ARMY MATERIALS & MECHANICS RESEARCH CENTER, Dr. Lenoe, Watertown MA
 ARMY MISSILE R&D CMD, Redstone Arsenal AL Sci. Info. Cen (Documents)
 ARMY TRANSPORTATION SCHOOL, MAJ T. Sweeney, Code ATSP CD-TE Fort Eustis VA
 ASST SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, Spec. Assist Engrg (Leonard), Washington, DC
 CINCLANT Civil Engr. Supp. Plans, Ofc Norfolk, VA
 CINCPAC Fac Engrng Div (J44) Makalapa, HI
 CNO Code NOP-964, Washington DC: OP987J (J. Boosman), Pentagon
 COMCBPAC Operations Off, Makalapa HI
 COMFAIRWESTPAC Security Offr, Misawa Japan
 COMNAVBEACHPHIBREFTRAGRU ONE San Diego CA
 COMNAV MARIANAS Code N4, Guam
 COMOCEANSYPAC SCE, Pearl Harbor HI
 COMSUBDEVRGRO ONE Operations Offr, San Diego, CA
 DEFENSE CIVIL PREPAREDNESS AGENCY J.O. Buchanan, Washington DC
 DEFENSE DOCUMENTATION CTR Alexandria, VA
 DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY Dir., Washington DC
 DESIG Army Logistics Mgt Center, Fort Lee, VA
 DNA STTL, Washington DC
 DOD Explosives Safety Board (Library), Washington DC
 DOE Dr. Cohen
 DINSRDC Code 1706, Bethesda MD
 DINSRDC Code 4121 (R. Rivers), Annapolis, MD
 ELICOMBATTRACENLANT PWO, Virginia Bch VA
 EMEI ANT CEC Offr, Norfolk VA
 MARINE CORPS BASE Camp Pendleton CA 92055: Code 43-260, Camp Lejeune NC: M & R Division, Camp Lejeune
 NC: PWO Camp Lejeune NC: PWO, Camp S. D. Butler, Kawasaki Japan
 MARINE CORPS HQS Code LFF-2, Washington DC
 MCAS Facil. Engr. Div, Cherry Point NC: Code PWE, Kaneohe Bay HI: Code S4, Quantico VA: PWO Kaneohe Bay
 HI: PWO, Yuma AZ: SCE, Futema Japan
 MCDEC NSAP REP, Quantico VA: P&S Div Quantico VA
 MCLSBPAC PWO, Barstow CA
 NAF PWD - Engr Div, Atsugi, Japan: PWO Sigonella Sicily: PWO, Atsugi Japan
 NAS CO, Guantanamo Bay Cuba: Code 114, Alameda CA: Code 183 (Fac. Plan BR MGR): Code 18700, Brunswick
 ME: Code 18U (ENS P.J. Hickey), Corpus Christi TX: Code 6234 (G. Trask), Point Mugu CA: Code 70, Atlanta,
 Marietta GA: Dir. Maint. Control Div., Key West FL: Dir. Util. Div., Bermuda: ENS Buchholz, Pensacola, FL:
 Lakehurst, NJ: PW (J. Maguire), Corpus Christi TX: PWD Maint. Cont. Dir., Fallon NV: PWD Maint. Div., New
 Orleans, Belle Chasse LA: PWD, Maintenance Control Dir., Bermuda: PWD, Willow Grove PA: PWO Belle
 Chasse, LA: PWO Chase Field Beeville, TX: PWO Key West FL: PWO Whiting Fld, Milton FL: PWO, Dallas TX:
 PWO, Glenview IL: PWO, Kingsville TX: PWO, Millington TN: PWO, Miramar, San Diego CA: PWO, Moffett
 Field CA: ROICC Key West FL: SCE Lant Fleet Norfolk, VA: SCE Norfolk, VA: SCE, Barbers Point HI:
 Security Offr, Alameda CA

NATL. RESEARCH COUNCIL. Naval Studies Board, Washington DC
 NAVACT PWO, London UK
 NAVAEROSPREGMEDCEN SCE, Pensacola FL
 NAVCOASTSYSSEN Code 772 (C B Koesy) Panama City FL
 NAVCOASTSYSTEMSCTR Code 713 (J. Quirk) Panama City, FL; Library Panama City, FL
 NAVCOMMAREAMSTRSTA PWO, Norfolk VA; PWO, Wahiawa HI; SCE Unit 1 Naples Italy
 NAVCOMMSTA Code 401 Nea Makri, Greece; PWO, Exmouth, Australia
 NAVEDTRAPRODEVEN Tech. Library
 NAVEDUTRACEN Engr Dept (Code 42) Newport, RI
 NAVEODFAC Code 605, Indian Head MD
 NAVFAC PWO, Centerville Bch, Ferndale CA
 NAVFAC PWO, Lewes DE
 NAVFACENGCOM Code 043 Alexandria, VA; Code 044 Alexandria, VA; Code 0451 Alexandria, VA; Code 0454B
 Alexandria, VA; Code 04B5 Alexandria, VA; Code 100 Alexandria, VA; Code 1002B (J. Leimanis) Alexandria, VA;
 Code 1113 (T. Stevens) Alexandria, VA; Code 1113 Alexandria, VA; Morrison Yap, Caroline Is.; P W Brewer
 Alexandria, VA
 NAVFACENGCOM - CHES DIV, Code 101 Wash, DC; Code 102, (Wildman), Wash, DC; Code 405 Wash, DC; Code
 FPO-1 Wash, DC
 NAVFACENGCOM - LANT DIV, Code 405, Norfolk, VA; Eur. BR Deputy Dir, Naples Italy; European Branch, New
 York; RDT&ELO 102, Norfolk VA
 NAVFACENGCOM - NORTH DIV, CO; Code 09P (LCDR A.J. Stewart); Code 102; Code 1028, RDT&ELO,
 Philadelphia PA; Design Div. (R. Masino), Philadelphia PA; ROICC, Contracts, Crane IN
 NAVFACENGCOM - PAC DIV, (Kyi) Code 101, Pearl Harbor, HI; Code 2011 Pearl Harbor, HI; Code 402, RDT&E,
 Pearl Harbor HI; Commander, Pearl Harbor, HI
 NAVFACENGCOM - SOUTH DIV, Code 405, RDT&ELO, Charleston, SC; Code 90, RDT&ELO, Charleston SC
 NAVFACENGCOM - WEST DIV, 102; Code 04B San Bruno, CA; 09P/20 San Bruno, CA; RDT&ELO Code 2011 San
 Bruno, CA
 NAVFACENGCOM CONTRACT AROICC, Point Mugu CA; AROICC, Quantico, VA; Eng Div dir, Southwest Pac,
 Manila, PI; OICC, Southwest Pac, Manila, PI; OICC/ROICC, Balboa Canal Zone; ROICC AF Guam; ROICC
 LANT DIV., Norfolk VA; ROICC Off Point Mugu, CA; ROICC, Keflavik, Iceland; ROICC, Pacific, San Bruno
 CA
 NAVHOSP LTR, Elsbend, Puerto Rico
 NAVMAG SCE, Guam
 NAVOCEANSYSSEN Research Lib., San Diego CA
 NAVPETOFF Code 30, Alexandria VA
 NAVPGSCOL Code 61WL (O. Wilson) Monterey CA
 NAVPHIBASE CO, ACB 2 Norfolk, VA; Code S3T, Norfolk VA
 NAVREGMEDCEN Code 29, Env. Health Serv. (Al Bryson) San Diego, CA; SCE (D. Kaye); SCE, Camp Pendleton
 CA; SCE, Oakland CA
 NAVSCOLCECOFF C35 Port Hueneme, CA
 NAVSEASYSKOM Code 0325, Program Mgr, Washington, DC
 NAVSEC Code 6034 (Library), Washington DC
 NAVSECGRUACT PWO, Adak AK; PWO, Torri Sta, Okinawa
 NAVSHIPYD; Code 202.4, Long Beach CA; Code 202.5 (Library) Puget Sound, Bremerton WA; Code 404 (LT J.
 Riccio), Norfolk, Portsmouth VA; Code 410, Mare Is., Vallejo CA; Code 440 Portsmouth NH; Code 440, Puget
 Sound, Bremerton WA; Library, Portsmouth NH; Tech Library, Vallejo, CA
 NAVSTA CO Naval Station, Mayport FL; CO Roosevelt Roads P.R. Puerto Rico; Maint. Div, Dir/Code 531, Rodman
 Canal Zone; PWD (LTJG P.M. Motolenich), Puerto Rico; PWO, Guantanamo Bay Cuba; PWO, Keflavik Iceland;
 PWO, Mayport FL; SCE, Guam; SCE, San Diego CA; SCE, Subic Bay, R.P.; Utilities Engr Off. (A.S. Ritchie),
 Rota Spain
 NAVSUPPACT CO, Seattle WA; LTJG McGarrah, SEC, Vallejo, CA
 NAVSURFWPCEN PWO, White Oak, Silver Spring, MD
 NAVTECHTRACEN SCE, Pensacola FL
 NAVWPNCEN Code 2636 (W. Bonner), China Lake CA; PWO (Code 26), China Lake CA; ROICC (Code 702), China
 Lake CA
 NAVWPNSIA Maint. Control Dir., Yorktown VA
 NAVWPNSIA PW Office (Code 09C1) Yorktown, VA
 NAVWPNSIA PWO, Seal Beach CA; Security Offr, Colts Neck NJ
 NAVWPNSUPPEN Code 09 Crane IN

NCBU 405 OIC, San Diego, CA
 PWC Code 420, Pensacola, FL
 NCBC CEL AOIC Port Hueneme CA: Code 10 Davisville, RI: Code 155, Port Hueneme CA: Code 156, Port Hueneme, CA: Code 400, Gulfport MS: PWO, Davisville RI
 NCR 20, Commander
 NMCB 5, Operations Dept.: 74, CO: Forty, CO: THREE, Operations Off.
 NORDA Code 440 (Ocean Rsch Off) Bay St. Louis MS
 NRL Code 8400 Washington, DC: Code 8441 (R.A. Skop), Washington DC
 NSC Code 54.1 (Wynne), Norfolk VA
 NSD SCE, Subic Bay, R.P.
 NTC Commander Orlando, FL: OICC, CBU-401, Great Lakes IL
 NUSC Code 131 New London, CT: Code EA123 (R.S. Munn), New London CT
 ONR Code 700F Arlington VA: Dr. A. Laufer, Pasadena CA
 PACMISRANFAC CO, Kekaha HI
 PHIBCB 1 P&E, Coronado, CA
 PMTC Pat. Counsel, Point Mugu CA
 PWC CO Norfolk, VA: CO, (Code 10), Oakland, CA: CO, Great Lakes IL: Code 10, Great Lakes, IL: Code 120, Oakland CA: Code 120C, (Library) San Diego, CA: Code 128, Guam: Code 154, Great Lakes, IL: Code 200, Guam: Code 220 Oakland, CA: Code 220.1, Norfolk VA: Code 30C, San Diego, CA: Code 400, Great Lakes, IL: Code 400, Oakland, CA: Code 400, Pearl Harbor, HI: Code 400, San Diego, CA: Code 420, Great Lakes, IL: Code 420, Oakland, CA: Code 600, Great Lakes, IL: Code 610, San Diego CA: Code 700, Great Lakes, IL: Code 700, San Diego, CA: LTJG J.L. McClaine, Yokosuka, Japan: Library, Subic Bay, R.P.: Utilities Officer, Guam: XO (Code 20) Oakland, CA
 NAF PWO (Code 30) El Centro, CA
 U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY Kings Point, NY (Reprint Custodian)
 US NAVAL FORCES Korea (ENJ-P&O)
 USCG G-EOF-4/61 (T. Dowd), Washington DC
 USDA Forest Service, Bowers, Atlanta, GA: Forest Service, San Dimas, CA
 USEUCOM (ECJ4/L-O), Wright, Stuttgart, GE
 USNA Ch. Mech. Engr. Dept Annapolis MD: PWD Engr. Div. (C. Bradford) Annapolis MD
 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY LONG BEACH, CA (CHELAPATI)
 CORNELL UNIVERSITY Ithaca NY (Serials Dept, Engr Lib.)
 DAMES & MOORE LIBRARY LOS ANGELES, CA
 FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY Boca Raton FL (Ocean Engr Dept., C. Lin)
 IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY Ames IA (CE Dept, Handy)
 LEHIGH UNIVERSITY Bethlehem PA (Fritz Engr. Lab No. 13, Beedle): Bethlehem PA (Linderman Lib. No. 30, Flecksteiner)
 LIBRARY OF CONGRESS WASHINGTON, DC (SCIENCES & TECH DIV)
 MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY Houghton, MI (Haas)
 MIT Cambridge MA: Cambridge MA (Rm 10-500, Tech. Reports, Engr. Lib.): Cambridge MA (Whitman)
 NY CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE BROOKLYN, NY (LIBRARY)
 OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY CORVALLIS, OR (CE DEPT. BELL): CORVALLIS, OR (CE DEPT. HICKS)
 PURDUE UNIVERSITY Lafayette IN (Leonards): Lafayette, IN (Altschaeffl): Lafayette, IN (CE Engr. Lib)
 SEATTLE U Prof Schwaegler Seattle WA
 SOUTHWEST RSCH INST R. DeHart, San Antonio TX
 STANFORD UNIVERSITY Engr Lib, Stanford CA
 STATE UNIV. OF NEW YORK Buffalo, NY
 TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY W.B. Ledbetter College Station, TX
 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY, CA (CE DEPT. GERWICK): BERKELEY, CA (CE DEPT. MITCHELL): DAVIS, CA (CE DEPT. TAYLOR): LIVERMORE, CA (LAWRENCE LIVERMORE LAB. TOKARZ)
 UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII Honolulu HI (Dr. Szilard)
 UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS Metz Ref Rm, Urbana IL: URBANA, IL (LIBRARY): URBANA, IL (NEWMARK): Urbana IL (CE Dept, W. Gamble)
 UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS (Heronemus), Amherst MA CE Dept
 UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN Ann Arbor MI (Richart)
 UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN Lincoln, NE (Ross Ice Shelf Proj.)
 UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO J. Nielson-Engr Mats & Civil Sys Div, Albuquerque NM
 UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME Katona, Notre Dame, IN

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS Inst. Marine Sci (Library), Port Arkansas TX
 UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN AUSTIN, TX (THOMPSON); Austin, TX (Breen)
 UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON Dept of Civil Engr (Dr. Mattock), Seattle WA; SEATTLE, WA (MERCHANT);
 Seattle, WA Transportation, Construction & Geom. Div
 URS RESEARCH CO. LIBRARY SAN MATEO, CA
 AMETEK Off-shore Res. & Engr Div
 ARVID GRANT OLYMPIA, WA
 ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO. DALLAS, TX (SMITH)
 BECHTEL CORP. SAN FRANCISCO, CA (PHELPS)
 BELGIUM HAECON, N.V., Gent
 BROWN & CALDWELL, E M Saunders Walnut Creek, CA
 CANADA Mem Univ Newfoundland (Charl), St Johns; Surveyor, Nenninger & Chenevert Inc., Montreal; Trans-Mnt
 Oil Pipe Line Corp. Vancouver, BC Canada
 FRANCE Dr. Dutertre, Boulogne
 GLIDDEN CO. STRONGSVILLE, OH (RSCH LIB)
 HALEY & ALDRICH, INC. Cambridge MA (Aldrich, Jr.)
 HUGHES AIRCRAFT Culver City CA (Tech. Doc. Ctr)
 ITALY M. Caironi, Milan
 MCCLELLAND ENGINEERS INC Houston TX (B. McClelland)
 McDONNELL AIRCRAFT CO. Dept 501 (R.H. Fayman), St Louis MO
 NEWPORT NEWS SHIPBLDG & DRYDOCK CO. Newport News VA (Tech. Lib.)
 NORWAY DET NORSKE VERITAS (Library), Oslo; DET NORSKE VERITAS (Roren) Oslo; I. Foss, Oslo; J.
 Creel, Ski; Norwegian Tech Univ (Brandtzaeg), Trondheim
 PORTLAND CEMENT ASSOC. SKOKIE, IL (CORLEY); Skokie IL (Rsch & Dev Lab, Lib.)
 RAND CORP. Santa Monica CA (A. Laupa)
 RAYMOND INTERNATIONAL INC. E. Colle Soil Tech Dept. Pennsauken, NJ
 SANDIA LABORATORIES Library Div., Livermore CA
 SCHUPACK ASSOC SO. NORWALK, CT (SCHUPACK)
 SHELL OIL CO. HOUSTON, TX (MARSHALL)
 SWEDEN Cement & Concrete Research Inst., Stockholm; GeoTech Inst
 TIDEWATER CONSTR. CO Norfolk VA (Fowler)
 TRW SYSTEMS REDONDO BEACH, CA (DAI)
 UNITED KINGDOM Cement & Concrete Assoc Wexham Springs, Slough Bucks; Cement & Concrete Assoc. (Lit.
 Ex), Bucks; D. Lee, London; D. New, G. Mainsell & Partners, London; R. Browne, Southall, Middlesex; Taylor,
 Woodrow Constr (014P), Southall, Middlesex
 WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP. Annapolis MD (Oceanic Div Lib, Bryant); Library, Pittsburgh PA
 WISS, JANNEY, ELSTNER, & ASSOC Northbrook, IL (D.W. Pfeifer)
 WOODWARD-CLYDE CONSULTANTS (A. Harrigan) San Francisco
 BROWN, ROBERT University, AL
 BULLOCK La Canada
 ERVIN, DOUG Belmont, CA
 F. HEUZE Boulder CO
 CAPT MURPHY Sunnyvale, CA
 R.E. BESIER Old Saybrook CT